

### **Remarks**

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed February 1, 2007. The specification is amended to address a formality and to update reference to related applications. Claims 7-11, 15, and 17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 and 12 are amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 7 and 15, respectively. Claim 1 is further amended to address a formality. Claims 1-6, 12-14, and 16 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for at least the following reasons.

#### **I. Objections**

In section 2 of the Action, claim 17 is object under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. This objection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Nevertheless, in the interest of moving this application into condition for allowance, claim 17 is canceled. Reconsideration and removal of the objection are therefore requested.

In section 3, the disclosure is objected to because of the use of the acronym "LCD." The specification is amended to provide a plain text description thereof. Reconsideration is requested.

#### **II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In sections 4-6 of the Action, claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejections is not conceded. Nevertheless, in the interest of moving this application into condition for allowance, claims 8-11 are canceled. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections are therefore requested.

#### **III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In sections 7 and 8 of the Action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Friedman, U.S. Patent No. 6,167,455. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

A. Claims 1-6

Claim 1 is directed to a commanding system for a computer. Claim 1 recites a memory storing an input module that accepts a plurality of input sequences across multiple input device categories, and a commanding element having a binding table that connects input to associated action, at least one binding entry in the binding table including sub-command bindings associated with the plurality of input sequences across multiple input device categories. Claim 1 recites that the memory further comprises a second commanding element having a second binding table that connects input to associated action, at least one binding entry in the second binding table including sub-command bindings associated with the plurality of input sequences across multiple input device categories. Claim 1 further recites a process programmed to, *inter alia*, invoke action connected with the input if the matching sub-command binding is found in the binding table, tunnel the input to the second commanding element, the second commanding element looking up the matching sub-command binding associated with the input in the second binding table; and invoke action connected with the input if the matching sub-command binding is found in the second binding table.

As described in example embodiments of the present application, tunneling is the process of traversing downward from a parent commanding element to its child, grandchild, etc. By tunneling the input through children commanding elements, additional and more flexible commanding functionality can be realized. Application, p. 9, ll. 3-9.

Friedman discloses a system that allows for synchronous execution of linked command objects. A command object 122 includes methods and attributes that implement the operation requested by the user. Friedman, col. 5, ll. 8-19. The command object 122 can include links to other command objects 122 to form linked command objects 128 that can be executed synchronously. Col. 5, ll. 25-54.

Friedman fails to disclose or suggest a commanding element having a binding table that connects input to associated action, at least one binding entry in the binding table including sub-command bindings associated with the plurality of input sequences across multiple input device categories as well as a second commanding element having a second binding table that connects input to associated action, at least one binding entry in the second binding table including sub-command bindings associated with the plurality of input sequences across multiple input device categories, as required by claim 1. Instead, Friedman simply discloses that two command

objects 122 can be linked and executed synchronously. Friedman fails to suggest multiple commanding elements, each including a binding table with a plurality of input sequences.

Further, Friedman fails to disclose a process programmed to tunnel the input to the second commanding element, the second commanding element looking up the matching sub-command binding associated with the input in the second binding table, and invoke action connected with the input if the matching sub-command binding is found in the second binding table. Again, Friedman only discloses a system wherein two command objects 122 can be linked and executed. Friedman fails to disclose or suggest a processor programmed to tunnel the input, as required by claim 1.

The action identifies the following section of Friedman as purportedly disclosing tunneling the input to a second commanding element:

Referring also to the flowgraph of FIG. 2, executing 204 the linked command objects 128 is generally done as follows: A first linked command object 128 in the active context 118 is executed 205, the execution managed by the active context 118. The execution will do the user selected operation on the selected data object(s) 120 in the active context 118, resulting in the invocation of the Do() method of the linked command object 128. A second linked command object 128 is then executed 207, similarly, again performing its Do() method. Each linked command object 128 performs its function in its context 118. On subsequent passes through execution 204, the Undo() and Redo() methods of the command objects 122 will be invoked, as necessary, to undo or redo the state of the data object 120.

Col. 7, ll. 15-28. However, as shown in Figure 2, this section of Friedman simply describes how two command objects 122, formed as a linked command object 128, are executed synchronously. This section of Friedman fails to disclose or suggest tunneling, let alone tunneling the input to the second commanding element, the second commanding element looking up the matching sub-command binding associated with the input in the second binding table, as required by claim 1

Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Friedman for at least these reasons. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

B. Claims 12-14 and 16

Claim 12 is directed to a method for commanding a computer system. Claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, receiving a request to report commanding information, traversing the binding table, and reporting each command in each entry of the binding table.

In example embodiments described in the application, such a method can be advantageous in a variety of contexts. For example, an accessibility tool's ability to query another application to ascertain the application's commanding information can be advantageous. For example, an accessibility tool for the visually-impaired can query an application and report the commands understood by the application to a visually-impaired user using an unconventional output such as a speech synthesizer. Application, p. 15, ll. 21-26.

Friedman fails to disclose or suggest such a method. For example, Friedman fails to disclose or even suggest the reporting of command information. Instead, Friedman simply discloses a system that allows actions to be invoked. The Action identifies column 7, lines 15-28 of Friedman (reprinted above) as disclosing such a method. However, this section of Friedman simply discloses how two command objects formed as a linked command object are executed. Friedman fails to even suggest the concept of reporting.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 12, as well as claims 13, 14, and 16 that depend therefrom, are therefore requested.

IV. Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: May 1, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky/  
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky  
Reg. No.: 50,471